1	2	3	4	5	6
20	Orissa ^^	27,235,112	19,661,504	72.19	March, 2007
21	Punjab ^^	16,859,720	15,693,997	93.09	March, 2007
22	Rajasthan^^	34,800,000	27,800,000	79.89	March, 2007
23	Sikkim ^^	305,992	222,766	72.80	March, 2007
24	Tamil Nadu	46,304,764	44,800,000	96.75	March, 2007
25	Tripura ^^	2,005,704	1,871,552	93.31	March, 2007
26	Uttar Pradesh^^	1,134,000,00	913,000,00	80.51	March, 2007
27	Uttarakhand^^	5,961,350	5,303,710	88.97	March, 2007
28	West Bengal	48,112,642	46,630,101	96.92	March, 2007
29	A and N Islands ^^	243,188	214,241	88.10	March, 2007
30	Chandigarh	572,662	402,304	70.25	March, 2007
31	D and N Haveli^^	133.250	95.645	71.78	March, 2007
32	Daman and Diu	88,263	60,447	68.49	March, 2007
33	Lakshadweep^^	40,241	37,617	93.48	March, 2007
34	NCT of Delhi ^^	10,123,095	6,262,840	61.87	March, 2007
35	Puducherry ^^	711,595	711,595	100.00	March, 2007
	TOTAL:	690913472	513712380	74.35	

**Except Data of elector of AC No. 4, 46, 49 & 50 in Arunachal Pradesh.

In the first phase in 1996-97, total 67,479 EPICs were prepared but not distributed. The issue of EPIC programme is currently not underway in Assam.

$ Data of Electors *w.r.t.* 1-1-2007 roll except 6 ACs Where final publication is due;

^^Data of Elector *w.r.t.* 1-1-2007 roll.

A total of 1033733 EPICs were issued for the photography done till 1997. As per the survey conducted by the Dy Commissioners 90% of them are not available with the electors owing to Snatching away of EPICs by the underground elements.

In Nagaland the EPIC % dropped down from 57.06% to 45.47% after Intensive Revision *w.r.t.* 1-1-2005 % Except Hyderabad where EPIC programme is in progress.

Removal of Supreme Court judges

2818. SHRI B.K. HARIPRASAD: Will the Minister of LAW AND JUSTICE be pleased to state:

(a) whether the proposed National Judicial Council would be empowered to recommend the removal of any Supreme Court judge, found guilty of misdemeanour after a probe at the instance of a citizen's complaint or a reference by the Parliament;

(b) whether any citizen can single-handedly request for a probe by the NJC against an erring Judge whereas a reference by the Parliament for a probe needs

the backing of at least 50 MPs from the Rajya Sabha or 100 MPs from the Lok Sabha; and

(c) whether this provision is discriminatory to MPs *vis-a-vis* the right to request for a probe by a single-citizen?

THE MINISTER OF LAW AND JUSTICE (SHRI H. R. BHARDWAJ): (a) Yes, Sir. However, in the complaint procedure, the Chief Justice of India has been Kept outside its purview.

(b) Yes, Sir.

(c) No, Sir. In so far as the powers of the Members of Parliament are concerned, they are not being curtailed as they shall have full right as available at present, to move a motion for removal of a Judge as per the provisions of the Law.

Representation of minorities in judiciary

2819. SHRI S.M. LALJAN BASHA: Will the Minister of LAW AND JUSTICE be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have done any survey of the poor representation of people from minority communities in the higher judiciary;

(b) if so, the details thereof;

(c) the steps that would improve the presence of minorities in the judiciary; and

(d) the steps proposed to encourage accommodation of minorities in the judiciary?

THE MINISTER OF LAW AND JUSTICE (SHRI H. R. BHARDWAJ): (a) to (d) Appointments of Judges of the Supreme Court of India and High Courts are made under articles 124 and 217 of the Constitution of India, respectively, which do not provide for reservation for any caste or class of persons. No survey has, therefore, been made by the Government regarding the representation of minority communities in the higher judiciary.

After the Supreme Court Judgment of October 6, 1993 in the Supreme Court Advocates-on-Record and Anr. *Vs.* Union of India, read with the Advisory Opinion of October 28, 1998, the entire process of initiation of proposal for appointment of a Judge of a Supreme Court lies with the Chief Justice of India and for the appointment of a Judge of a High Court, with the Chief Justice of that High Court.

The Government have however, addressed letters to the Chief Ministers of the States and the Chief Justices of the High Courts, from time to time, requesting them to locate persons from the Bar belonging to Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes, other Backward Classes, Minorities and amongst Women who are suitable for appointment as High Court Judges.